

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Minor amendments are made to the abstract and specification in accordance with U.S. patent practice. No new matter is believed added. Approval and entry are requested.

The original claims 1-26 are canceled in favor of new claims 27-50. Support for the new claims is found in the original claims 1-26 and in the specification as filed.

Several of the originally-filed claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The newly-submitted claims remedy the concerns raised by the Examiner. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore requested.

Claims 1-11, 13, and 15-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated based on Boland (EP 1045604 A2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Boland does not satisfy this rigorous standard.

In Boland, the service priority data associated with mobile subscribers 111 (mobile subscriber stations 101) is stored in a Home Location Register 113. The system in Boland compares the identity of a mobile subscriber station 101 with the service priority data stored in the HLR 113 for the mobile subscriber station 101 to determine whether this mobile subscriber station 101 is entitled to wireless service etc, see page 14, lines 5–12.

Although the stored priority data in Boland may be similar to the claimed priority-tables, the stored priority data in Boland is associated with mobile subscribers and/or mobile subscriber stations (a terminal) and not with a coverage area as is the case for the claimed priority-tables. Hence, the terminals/subscribers in Boland always have the same priority within the whole coverage area of the system. In contrast, the claimed user-device may have different service levels in different coverage areas as a result of the claimed priority-tables.

Given that Boland does not disclose priority-tables associated with coverage areas within the system, the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn. Indeed, neither Boland nor Artamo disclose or suggest the possibility of having different priorities in different coverage areas of a telecommunication system.

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /John R. Lastova/
John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:nd
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100